

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. Claims 2-11, 13-24, 26 and 27 have been withdrawn. By this Amendment, claims 1-27 are amended, and the Abstract is replaced with a substitute Abstract. No new matter is added by this Amendment. For example, support for the language added to the independent claims may be found at, for example, pages 27-28 of the specification and Fig. 5.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Diaz at the telephone interview held November 3, 2005, and the personal interview held on December 8, 2005, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interviews.

I. Restriction Requirement

The Office Action withdraws claims 2-11, 13-24, 26 and 27 as being directed to non-elected species. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, all of claims 1-4, 8-25 and 28 read on the elected species and at least claims 8-10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 19-24 are generic to all species. Furthermore, upon an allowance of a generic claim, all claims should be rejoined and similarly allowed.

II. Specification

The specification was objected to because the Abstract contained more than 150 words. Applicants replace the original Abstract with an Abstract including less than 150 words. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

III. Claim Objection

Claim 28 is objected to under 37 CFR §1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 recites that a plurality of documents is generated by a same operator.

Claim 28 depends from claim 1 and adds that the plurality of documents is authored by the same operator. Claim 28 depends from claim 1 and adds a further feature in that the plurality of documents is not only generated by the same operator, but also authored by the same operator.

As acknowledged by the Examiner during the November 3 interview, because claim 28 adds the feature that the same operator authored the plurality of documents in addition to having generated the plurality of the documents, claim 28 does further limit the subject matter of the previous claim.

As acknowledged by the Examiner during the November 3 interview, this objection is overcome. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

IV. Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 12 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; claims 1, 12 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter; and claims 1, 12, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,115,709 (Gilmour). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 12 are amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. As acknowledged by the Examiner during the November 3, 2005 interview, this rejection is overcome.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1, 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §101, Applicants submit that the claims are directed to statutory subject matter. See Ex Parte Lundgren (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. October 2005). (There is no separate "technological arts" test for determining whether a claimed process amounts to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.) Nonetheless, the Examiner noted during the November 3, 2005 interview that the amendments to the claims that overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second

paragraph, also overcome the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §101. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is moot.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1, 12, 25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Gilmour, Applicants submit that Gilmour fails to anticipate the subject matter of the claims. In particular, Gilmour fails to disclose monitoring documents to determine if a document has been updated or newly added, as recited in claims 1 and 25.

Furthermore, as acknowledged by the Examiner during the December 8 personal interview, Gilmour fails to disclose the project management-related task assignment of the present application. The independent claims are amended to include that the computer executable management part selects new operator(s) based on the features extracted from the jobs of the operator(s).

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Gilmour does not anticipate claims 1 and 25, or claims 12 and 28 depending therefrom.

For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:LMS:RBI/eks

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: December 30, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
